



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Die Altertumswissenschaft im letzten Vierteljahrhundert, im Verein mit mehreren Fachgenossen bearbeitet von WILHELM KROLL. Leipzig: Reisland, 1905. Pp. vii + 547. M. 14.

The wonder of the layman, that there is still left anything to discover concerning Greek and Roman antiquity, is a familiar thing, not without its justification, not altogether easy to satisfy, and deserving of considerate attention. It would seem, therefore, peculiarly gratifying that a work is here at hand to which the curious may be referred for a record of the progress of classical studies during the past twenty-five or thirty years. But the contributors to this volume are fighters in the ranks, and they write rather for the information of their fellows in other parts of the field than for the enlightenment of the non-combatant. The book is not for the general reader, for, except in some few fields, the progress which it records is the slow movement which characterizes the advance of science as a whole; it is rather like the growth of an irregular spiral, the rise of which is at some points conspicuous, and again is scarcely distinguishable, if at all, from fruitless revolution in circles. Striking progress, apparent to all the world, is discernible only in some few fields, those especially which have received access of important new material—archaeology, epigraphy, and, thanks to the explorations of the archaeologist, Greek literature and history.

On the whole, surveying the record which is here set forth with varying skill, it can be said confidently that the period has been a fruitful one, and it would doubtless be recorded as such even without the discoveries which in certain fields lend it conspicuous brilliancy. To compare it with the period (say of forty years) which preceded is difficult. Each age is the heir of its predecessor, and it will be found in general that the period under review has occupied itself chiefly with the execution of the tasks which the classical philology of the middle of the nineteenth century had outlined. It has been a time of orderly settlement and occupation, rather than of pioneer exploration and conquest. Names to place beside those of Lachmann, Ritschl, Madvig, Cobet, Droysen, Grote, Zeller, Mommsen (who belongs of right to the earlier time) it can scarcely show. But the period has not lacked independence and initiative. The great discoveries in epigraphy, in art, and in Greek literature have shown that it could rise equal to tasks as great and difficult as those which confronted the heroic race of an earlier time.

A survey of classical studies emanating from any source would of necessity be largely a review of the results of German scholarship, and it cannot be wondered at that a book of German authorship should lay itself open to the charge of neglecting somewhat the labors of non-German workers. But the matter is one which cannot be urged graciously in view of the conscientious labor which all of the contributors have devoted to

their respective fields. A decent gratitude forbids it. One regret, however, I shall not repress—that some competent contributor was not found to put together in large outline the general points of view which characterize the present study of classical antiquity and in a measure differentiate it from the period preceding. For even so general a summary as this does not escape the danger of losing sight of the whole in contemplation of particular conquests. But some points emerge with sufficient clearness to be easily observed. First, and most conspicuous perhaps (though no allusion, I believe, is made to it), is the disappearance of the conception of a unified science of antiquity, an *Altertumswissenschaft*—though that is the title which the work bears. But the term no longer means what it meant to the middle of the nineteenth century. The once stately edifice has fallen into ruin, and yields up its material to be lost in the construction of a still larger whole. For classical antiquity can no longer be interpreted (to change the figure) as a well-rounded and orderly plot observing the dramatic unities. It has lapsed from the position of idealization which it inherited from the early Renaissance, and which was reinforced by the romanticists of German scholarship at the beginning of the nineteenth century; it has taken its place as a segment of universal history which many sciences have to cross without either beginning or ending within its limits.

This change of conception is the result of a developed historical sense, which is perhaps the chief advance in point of view that the period under consideration as a whole has to show. In practical application it has meant that one subject after another—grammar, literary and stylistic history, the so-called antiquities—has passed from the domination of the restricted classical (or dogmatic) point of view to a treatment genetic and evolutionary. Even history has had to free itself from the prejudice of inherited habit and (for example) to restore to its rights the political, social, and economic importance of the period of Hellenism, recognizing that history could not well stop at the very point where the wider mission of Hellas as the civilizer and intellectual unifier of the ancient world began.

One result of this development of historical vision is the great change which has taken place in the general attitude toward the criticism and interpretation of ancient texts. Conjectural criticism, which still flourished with scarcely diminished pre-eminence in the middle of the nineteenth century, has been relegated to a more subordinate position. Higher criticism no longer finds an audience so credulous of light-hearted skepticism, which was the mode fifty years ago. The historical study of grammar and style has banished many a triumphant “emendation.” The evidence of the texts has been vindicated against many venerable suspicions of spuriousness. Investigation into the history of the transmission of literary works has led to an increasing realization of the

complexity of the problems involved; it has begun to banish the simplified critical apparatus which since Lachmann's time has been the ideal of most editors; the papyri of Egypt have risen up to vindicate in many instances the testimony of the despised *deteriores*. But, most of all, patient investigation and widening knowledge have exalted the function of interpretation, have shown that many of the hardest knots are to be untied, not cut. What is here said of criticism and interpretation in relation to single passages or works applies in similar manner to the larger treatment of whole movements and periods of literary history.

The execution of the several chapters which make up the book is naturally uneven, in conception of the task, in method of treatment, and in skill of presentation. A few of them I shall select for brief comment or characterization. The chapter entitled "Antike Kunst" (by Sauer, of Giessen) seemed to me the most eloquent and interesting of the whole book. The great opportunity which the theme afforded has been used by the writer for an impressive and admirable survey of the great advance which classical archaeology has made since 1875. Another such opportunity was afforded by "Greek Literature," but the chapter (by Gercke, of Greifswald), though instructive, fails of an impressiveness worthy of the subject and the time. For Gercke has aimed rather to illustrate method than to record results, and, choosing for this purpose naturally those subjects in which he has himself worked, he unconsciously focuses the light not less upon himself than upon his subject. The chapter on "Greek History" (by Lenschau) is very instructive and interesting. It is one of the few fields in which large and comprehensive interpretations of the material have been undertaken—in the histories of Holm, Beloch, Pöhlmann, Busolt, Meyer, Niese, and others—a circumstance due doubtless to the great modifications which historiography in general has undergone through the influence of new political, economic, and sociological points of view. The chapter on "Roman Public Law" (by Stein) devotes much space to the analysis and characterization of Mommsen's great work. Although the writer's estimate is in the highest degree laudatory, yet I could not but feel that his description of Mommsen's bold constructive and subjective method must awaken suspicion concerning the validity of such method, and inspire a sympathy for Madvig's valiant protest, which for Stein is essentially a retrogressive step. The brief chapter on "Greek and Roman Metric" (by Radermacher), with which the work opens, is a disappointing performance. No adequate conception of the present trend of this chaotic subject can be gained from it, though there was much here both of presentation and criticism to invite treatment. The review of "Roman Literature" (by Kroll) is painstaking and thorough within the limits of space prescribed, though it fails somewhat of its opportunity to illustrate in a large way the historical continuity of Greek and Roman literature. The chapter on

"Latin Grammar" will disappoint American scholars from the fact that syntax is treated only very cursorily by Kroll, who at the last moment was compelled to assume the subject which Skutsch had undertaken, but through illness was prevented from treating. The other chapters which make up the book are: "Greek Grammar," by Hoffmann; "Greek Philosophy" (a very thorough review, though rather from the standpoint of literary history), by Prächter; "Mathematics, Mechanics, and Astronomy," by Heiberg; "Greek Medicine," by Wellman; "Roman History," by Holzapfel; "Greek Public Antiquities," by Swoboda; "Private Life of Antiquity," by Blümner; "Ancient Geography," by Ruge; "Ancient Religion," by Bloch.

Where so much is offered it will seem ungrateful to complain that anything is wanting. But, surveying the developments of the past twenty-five years, nothing is more striking than the fact that out of classical philology have grown several new and quasi-independent "philologies," so to speak. Surely nothing could more justly challenge the interest of the devotees of the mother-science than to follow the development of these lusty offshoots of the parent stem. I have in mind such subjects as the Greek papyri, Byzantine literature and history, and—a subject especially difficult to survey—the new mediaeval Latin philology.

G. L. HENDRICKSON

Bacchylides, The Poems and Fragments. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Prose Translation. By R. C. JEBB. Cambridge: University Press, 1905. Pp. xviii+524. 15s.

It is neither desirable nor possible in our space to discuss the endless questions of text and interpretation suggested by Jebb's *Bacchylides*. The reviewer can only express his gratitude for this, the latest of many gifts of the master from whom we shall receive no more. If the word "definitive" is ever in place, it applies to Jebb's editing. This does not mean that he is infallible, but it expresses our recognition of a finish of form that may well be the despair of imitation, and a fulness of well-ordered content that supplies all the materials even of divergent judgments. His translations are as idiomatic as Jowett's, as exact and inevitable as Munro's. His astonishing virtuosity fills long lacunae with verse which, if not what Bacchylides actually wrote, is what he would gladly have signed, and his modest common-sense offers these *tours de force* as mere indications of the probable meaning. He unites German critical erudition in the constitution of a text and the compilation of a commentary with French skill in the presentation of his matter and the instinctive poetic feeling that ought to be, if it is not always, the birthright of English scholarship. Of "investigators" and investigations there is no lack. But we shall not soon see another such editor.